

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicant would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document, and for acknowledgement that the drawings are acceptable, in the Official Action.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1 and 3-14 will have been amended, and claim 2 will have been canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained-therein). Claims 1 and 3-14 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

Initially, Applicant notes that the Specification has been amended to clarify the term "longitudinally".

In the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More particularly, the Examiner rejected the claims asserting that the Applicant's use of the terms "longitudinally," "widthwise direction," and "heightwise direction" are confusing. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, the claims have been amended, where appropriate, to replace "longitudinally" with --width-wise direction of the socket body-- and to further clarify other directional terminology. More specifically, Applicant notes that the previous recitation of "longitudinally" (i.e., as contained in the paragraph beginning on Page 12, line 9, of the present Specification) referred to the longitudinal extent of the contact and not the socket. Thus, the present amendment to the claims is merely to clarify

the orientation of the elements of the connector, as well as other features of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, the above noted rejection is believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over IGARASHI (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0014335) in view of KIHARA (U.S. Patent No. 6,619,965). Further, Applicant notes that the Examiner has included 35 U.S.C. § 102 in the header on Page 3 of the Official Action, as well as the statutory language of 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)/(e) on Page 4 of the Official Action. However, Applicant notes that the Examiner has not provided any rationale for rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, Applicant presumes that the inclusion of the header and statutory language of 35 U.S.C. § 102 in the Official Action is an inadvertent error on the Examiner's part.

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, claims 1 and 11 have been amended solely in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, while the amendments to the language of the various dependent claims have been made to merely enhance clarity and to conform to amendments made to the claims from which these dependent claims depend.

In this regard, Applicant notes that IGARASHI and KIHARA, alone or in any properly reasoned combination, do not disclose each and every element as recited in amended claim 1 (i.e., even assuming, arguendo, that the applied references have been properly combined).

In particular, claim 1 recites a connector including, inter alia, a header having a header body formed of an insulation material, and a plurality of header posts held on side

walls of the header body, the header body having header reinforcing metal fittings which are not electrically connected to the header posts, and a cross-section of fixed portions of the header reinforcing metal fittings, when viewed in a longitudinal direction of the socket, being substantially the same as a cross-section of a terminal end of the header post.

Applicant submits that IGARASHI and KIHARA, alone or in any properly reasoned combination, lacks any disclosure of at least the above-noted combination of elements.

In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner asserts that IGARASHI discloses the presently claimed fittings. More specifically, the Examiner considers the holding fixtures 30 and 32 of IGARASHI to be the presently claimed header reinforcing metal fittings. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, holding fixtures 30 and 32 of IGARASHI is structurally very different from the presently claimed header reinforcing metal fittings. In this regard, holding fixtures 30 and 32 of IGARASHI have leg portions 30f and 32f (respectively) which have a much larger cross-section than the fixed portions of the header reinforcing metal fittings of the present claimed invention (i.e., when the aforementioned cross-section is viewed in a longitudinal direction of the socket).

Further, KIHARA discloses pins 35 which position the connector 13 on the circuit board 12.

Thus, even assuming, arguendo, that the applied references have been properly combined IGARASHI and KIHARA, alone or in any properly reasoned combination, do not disclose at least the presently claimed cross-section of the fixed portions of the reinforcing metal fittings, when viewed in a longitudinal direction of the socket, being

substantially the same as a cross-section of a terminal end of the header post, as recited in claim 1.

In regard to method claims 1-14, the Examiner has not set forth any rationale as to how or where the presently claimed method is disclosed. In this regard, Applicant notes that IGARASHI and KIHARA, alone or in any properly reasoned combination, do not disclose at least the presently claimed method of inserting the conductive terminals into a die, wherein a number of pairs of conductive terminals inserted into the die are two greater than a number of pairs of the subsequently provided header posts, as recited in claim 11.

In this regard, Applicant notes that at least one advantage of the aforementioned method is that conductive terminals may easily be formed to provide the socket reinforcing metal fittings. Thus, manufacturing of the recited structure is simplified.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-10 and 12-14, Applicant asserts that these claims are allowable on their own merit, as well as because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 11, which Applicant has shown to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.


SUMMARY

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an indication to that effect. Applicant has argued the allowability of the claims and pointed out deficiencies of the applied references. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Applicant notes that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance and should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between the claims prior to the present amendment and the amended claims. Further, no acquiescence as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections is made by the present amendment. All other amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenji OOKURA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bruce H. Bernstein', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with a large, looping 'B' and a long, sweeping tail that extends downwards and to the right.

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

July 30, 2007
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1941 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191